How Three Republican Senators Called for Negotiation, Pps. 2-3

It Makes Good Pictures But Is It The Same As Real Debate?

"President Johnson has quietly staged a revolution in executive relations with Congress. . . . The President invited every one of the 537 members of the Senate and House to unprecedented briefing sessions at the White House. . . . Some of the immediate impact can be seen in the intent faces in the accompanying unposed pictures. . . . One man who heard the President explain his Viet Nam policy said he could almost feel a growing . . . welding together. . . . Some Congressmen choked up. . . . Since these sessions began, an administration official noted, agitation for negotiation . . . has subsided noticeably."

—Captions with pictures, Washington Star, *March 28.*

"The day after his inauguration, the President held his first leadership meeting at the White House with members of both political parties. As Chairman of the Republican Conference, I attended. At that time, we were briefed by members of the Cabinet on such issues as Vietnam. The briefing lasted for about two and a half hours with no real opportunity to ask questions or contribute comments. At the conclusion, photographers were called in and the impression was created that the President had developed his policies in consultation with Congressional leaders."

—Rep. Melvin R. Laird (R. Wis.) *in a statement (abr.) March 31.*

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XIII, NO. 13 APRIL 5, 1965 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

On the Klan, the Reds and the Un-Americans

It is characteristic of all human societies to take effects for causes. This provides scapegoats by which people evade their responsibilities. An example is the uproar over the Klan in the murder of Mrs. Viola Gregg Liuzzo. Klansmen may have pulled the trigger, but the bullet, the gun and the hate were supplied by the South. In a fundamental sense the South is guilty: its century of lawless resistance to full emancipation, its maintenance of *mores* that prescribe the humiliation and degradation of the Negro, its elevation of racial purity and supremacy to a regional religion, all these have fostered that sexual sickness which made the killers feel they were carrying out a sacred duty to the white race. *Mrs. Liuzzo was executed in her car because there was a Negro on the front seat with her*: this is the truth about the murder people shy away from. Killing is encouraged by the general feeling in the South, among its "good" people as well as its bad, whenever civil rights workers are slain—that they somehow got what they asked for, that they had no right to "butt in" on the South's affairs. The Klan and the murder are the result. To focus on the Klan is to enable the respectables who know better to put their guilt on "rednecks" who don't. To propagate racial ethics is to foster racial murder.

Vulgar Opportunism

On top of this regional sickness is a national sickness—that when anything goes wrong it must be due to Communists. A paranoid corollary is that only firm anti-Communists are above suspicion. This underlies the Administration's pressure to have the Klan investigated by the House Un-American Activities Committee. "This is because its chairman, Mr. Willis, is a Southerner," Tom Wicker diclosed in the *New York Times* March 30, "and because the committee's reputation would make it immune to charges of leftist influence." Does it take an investigation to prove that an organization which preaches Anglo-Saxon white Protestant supremacy is un-American? Could so obvious a proposition be regarded as "leftism?" "The possibility that the Klan might also be treated as a subversive group," Mr. Wicker reports White House reasoning, "probably would have to await the outcome of a Congressional investigation." Is study required to realize that organizations which preach hatred of Negroes, Jews and Catholics and contempt for Americans of "non Anglo-Saxon" origin are profoundly disruptive in a nation like ours? This was the strategy of Nazi propaganda before the war—to set Americans against each other by anti-Semitism and racism. To ask so discredited a bunch of witch-hunting old dodoes as the House Un-American Activities Committee to investigate the Klan is to demonstrate how shaky is our own commitment to our supposed national ideals. It is also to reveal the vulgar opportunism in the White House.

(Continued on Page Four)

Maybe We Ought to Bomb England

Mr. VAN DER LINDEN (Nashville, Tenn. Banner): Governor Johnson, you just said that some of the civil rights workers who came into Mississippi last summer were there to stir up trouble. The charge has been made on the floor of Congress that this whole invasion, so called, was planned by the international Communist conspiracy. . . . Do you have any proof that Communists really were behind this movement?

Gov. JOHNSON (Miss.): When this program began last summer we had sent some agents from Mississippi who attended the [freedom] school in Ohio. We had learned from them that there were some Communistic influences in this group that was coming to the state. . . . Some of these hard-core agitators were members of the Communist Party—and were confessed members.

Mr. VAN DER LINDEN: Has that been brought to the attention of the FBI and other government agencies—are they prosecuting any of these people?

Gov. JOHNSON: No, sir, they are not. I think that they are keeping a very close eye on these people. Some of these people that I speak about have gone back where they came from. There was one there from England, who participated in this peace movement against our establishing our submarines in Europe or in England.

—On Meet the Press, Feb. 14, 1965.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Javits Says His Mail Running 50-to-1 Against the War in Vietnam . . .

The press has inadequately reported the break-through for peace in the Senate on March 25 when three Republicans asked for negotiations on Vietnam. We thought readers would like to see the main points they made and give them here in excerpted form. The most significant speech was by Javits of New York, who has hitherto been a cold warrior in foreign policy, though a liberal in domestic affairs. He introduced a resolution declaring the U.S. ready for "honorable negotiation" which was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. Interested citizens and organizations should demand open hearings on it. Senator John Sherman Cooper (Ky.) *who joined in quite independently the same day is a liberal whose service as Ambassador to India made him especially sensitive to Asian opinion. The third Republican was Aiken of Vermont.*

Sen. JAVITS: . . . We cannot pull out as we stand now. We can only honorably perform our commitments, unless the ground is washed out from under us and it becomes absolutely clear that there is no will to resist in South Vietnam.

My added purpose in submitting the concurrent resolution stems from an acute awareness of a grave danger that we face in our efforts to contain Communist expansion in southeast Asia, a danger that is too seldom mentioned, perhaps because it is the one that should most readily be dealt with. I speak of the danger caused by an erosion of support among the American people themselves. . . .

Mail 50 to 1 for Peace

One gauge of the gravity of this danger is congressional mail, and a recent survey by *U.S. News & World Report* among the Senators of both parties and all political colorations shows this mail running against our military action in Vietnam. For months, though it may sound extreme, my own mail has been running in some weeks as high as 50 to 1 against our Vietnam operation, and contacts with other sources of constituent opinion bear out the fact that much misunderstanding exists on this issue.

One factor which contributes to misunderstanding is the lack of authoritative information concerning the will of the Vietnamese people. More and more, in recent weeks, the desire of the South Vietnamese to carry on the struggle and continue to receive our assistance has been questioned. How can we find out what the South Vietnamese people really want? . . . I am sure the President has access to more facts and more reliable information than the rest of us. . . . If the President concludes that a majority of the people are determined to resist and want our help—as I assume is implicit in the continuance of our presence there—the announcement of this conclusion and the evidence on which it is based would serve to gain further support for our policy.

But the principal cause of the danger of loss of support for our policy is that many Americans are worried and confused over our aims and our plans in South Vietnam. They need reassurance that we do, in fact, have an attainable goal and are taking all proper measures to attain it.

This danger of erosion of American support can be met, in my judgment, if the President deals with this question: Since our aim is not unconditional surrender, what are the general principles on which we are willing to negotiate a settlement of the Vietnamese situation? . . . We all know that the retaliatory use of air power alone is not a policy in a complex political and social, as well as military situation. . . . It is clear that the political problems of the south will not be resolved only by military pressure on the north. It is also clear that we are not engaged in South Vietnam for an "unconditional surrender" which, as everyone knows, would be impossible at this time. . . .

In my view the general principles for honorable negotia-

We Didn't Want to Napalm Our Own Men

"Two of the three military operations in which nonlethal gas was used against the Viet Cong were unsuccessful attempts to free American prisoners held by the Communist guerrillas, it was learned yesterday. . . . Intelligence reports had indicated the location of the camp in which some or all of the Americans were being held. Vietnamese forces and American advisers on Dec. 23 went after the site somewhere in the Mekong Delta. . . . The pursuers used gas in an attempt to disable the Viet Cong without risking the Americans' lives. The effort to liberate the prisoners failed. They were spirited out—if indeed they were there in the first place—before South Vietnamese and American troops on the ground could close in. Two days later, new intelligence reports placed the prisoners at another camp. . . . The pursuit operation was repeated on Christmas Day, it was said here, with helicopters spreading gas and ground forces moving in afterward. Again there were no positive results."

—N. Y. Herald-Tribune *from Washington Mar. 27.*

16 Congressmen Ask LBJ To Reaffirm FDR and Ike Pledges Not to Use Gas First in War

"Dear Mr. President: The actions of our military in South Vietnam in providing riot-control type gases appear to have violated our long standing policy against the first use of gas in warfare. This policy was first enunciated on June 9, 1943, by President Roosevelt, who said 'Use of such weapons has been outlawed by the general opinion of mankind. This country has not used them and I hope that we never will be compelled to use them. I state categorically that we shall under no circumstances resort to the use of such weapons unless they are first used by our enemies.' It was reaffirmed on January 13, 1960, by President Eisenhower who said, when asked at a press conference about our government's policy on the use of gas in warfare: 'So far as my instinct is concerned, (it) is not to start such a thing as that first.'

"The first use of gas in warfare, however innocuous its variety or effective its results, subjects the using country to the censure of the civilized world. . . . In the hope that some action may be taken in the interest of our national prestige and moral standing, may we respectfully suggest: (1) That since the area commander apparently had authority to use these riot-control gases . . . an investigation be made into the means by which such authority was extended . . . (2) that exclusive control and discretion over the use of chemical, biological and radiological weapons be restored to the Presidency and finally (3) that, in the light of former executive pronouncements, an expression of this Administration's policy toward the use of these weapons be made."

—Signed by Brown, Burton, Edwards, Hawkins and Wilson of California; Conyers and Diggs of Michigan, Green of Oregon, Kastenmeier and Race of Wisconsin, Mink of Hawaii, Nix of Pennsylvania and Ottinger, Resnick, Rosenthal and Ryan of New York, all Democrats.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . Cooper Says U.S. Prescribing Unacceptable Conditions for Negotiation

tions . . . should include. 1st. A cease-fire halting both the fighting in South Vietnam and the air strikes against North Vietnam. 2d. Establishment of an International Commission on Vietnam to supervise the cease-fire. . . . 3rd. Establishment of a government in South Vietnam with free institutions. . . . 4th. Normalization of trade and other economic relations between North and South Vietnam. . . .

Cooper Asks Unconditional Negotiation

Sen. COOPER: Let me emphasize the single point that I desire to make. It is that the President make it clear again that the U.S. is willing to enter into negotiations. . . . I believe that our government is prescribing conditions as a prerequisite to negotiations which will not be accepted.

The Communist Chinese and the North Vietnamese have announced as a condition of negotiation that the U.S. must withdraw from South Vietnam. This is a condition which the President rightfully says cannot and will not be accepted. But our Government has imposed its own condition—that it is not prepared to enter into negotiations until the intervention and aggression of North Vietnam ceases. . . . I think it unlikely that the Communists will agree to this condition, as we will not agree to their condition. It is a kind of demand from both sides of unconditional surrender. . . . In Korea, and in Vietnam, in 1954 no such conditions were imposed by either side. . . .

If our bombing is accelerated, it could reach a point where the intransigeance of the Communists will be hardened, and the intervention of the Communist Chinese and Russia made more likely. And I must say that the use of harmless gas . . . is wrong in the present situation and is more likely to harden the position of the Communists. . . . At times there are rumors also of the old theory of preventive war. Knowing the President as a man of peace and honor, I say categorically that it is not his theory or purpose. But there may be some who hold to this theory. I do not believe it is consistent with the tradition of our country, or with our system of free government. . . . I hope our country will make it clear that we are willing to accept the offices of the Geneva Conference, or the United Nations, or perhaps a "community" of concerned nations. . . .

It has been a long time ago, but in 1954 I spoke in the Senate urging that negotiations be undertaken respecting the problem of Vietnam, rather than the use of our own troops. Last April I made the statement in the Senate, that I thought it was time for negotiations. . . . I believe that it is necessary for the President to make it clear that we are willing to enter true negotiations without conditions [imposed by either side]. . . .

—In the Senate, March 25

What Air Raids Can Do to 'Dominoes'

Sen. MANSFIELD (D. Mont.): Is it likely in the Senator's judgment that a settlement in Vietnam would be followed certainly by all the other nations in southeast Asia going down the Chinese drain, so to speak? . . .

Sen. AIKEN (R. Vt.): I do not believe that it would be followed by that. I do not believe that the smaller countries of southeast Asia have any more desire to become satellites of China and come under the control of Red China than have the countries of Eastern Europe any desire to be satellites of Russia, from which they are now gradually emerging into their own again —I hope they are anyway. I believe that North Vietnam has every reason in the world not to wish to become a satellite of Red China; and that she will not become a satellite of Red China unless the United States forces her to become one. But, if we continue raids over North Vietnam and continue the use of the weapons which we have been using more or less indiscriminately, we may force North Vietnam to call on China for Chinese troops by the millions. . . .

Sen. MANSFIELD: The Senator is correct . . . based on the more than 1,000 years of enmity which has existed between the people of Vietnam and the Chinese colossus.

—In the Senate, March 25.

Aiken Says Time Has Come to Compromise Article 19 and Put The UN Back Into Business

"Senators will recall that during debate on the UN bond issue [in 1962 to pay for the Congo operations] some of us questioned the Administration rather vigorously on two points: We sought to learn from the Department of State what the American reaction would be if the General Assembly were at some future time to assess the United States for the costs of sending a UN force into some area where the U.S. had its vital interests involved on the other side. . . . This was a question the State Department did not want to consider, let alone answer. The Department was so concerned with rubbing the Russian and French noses into the legal interpretation of Article 19; it was so sure that the General Assembly would never find the U.S. on the minority side. . . .

"The second point some of us pursued with the Administration was that the UN bond issue was an unfortunate device to put off the evil day when . . . the national interests of a great power would serve to nullify article 19. That day is now here. . . .

"When the chips were really down and the U.S. was confronted with the alternative of forcing an Assembly vote on the application of Article 19 to Russia and France, with the possibility that a winning vote might have led to Russian withdrawal, it backed away. The U.S. now recognizes that if it were in the position of the Russians or the French it would probably react in the same way. . . .

"I want the UN to survive. I want it capable of action in trouble spots. . . . I want UN bridges to be strong enough to bear all kinds of traffic between East and West. . . . The time has come for the President to . . . instruct his representative at the UN to reconcile our position with the Soviet and French position on the assessment of members for peacekeeping functions. . . . What if article 19 does become a dead letter if, as a result, the UN continues available as an instrument of peace? Unless some agreement is reached by the great Powers, article 19 is dead as a doornail anyway. International events of recent weeks seem to have overwhelmed the capacity of this Government for affirmative action, except in the military field.

"The President has a magnificent opportunity to put the U.S. back into the lead in international diplomacy by putting the UN back into business."

—Aiken (R. Vt.) to the Senate March 25 in opposing escalation in Vietnam and calling for negotiations.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Strategy Is to Divide and Discredit the Civil Rights Movement

(Continued from Page One)

Do We Never Learn?

To hear Speaker McCormack joining in is to despair of people ever learning from the past. The Un-American Activities Committee originated in the Dickstein-McCormack resolution of 1934. The "un-American" propaganda it was supposed to investigate was the racist propaganda by the Nazis with assistance from native groups like the Klan. But very soon, under the chairmanship of another Southerner, Dies of Texas, the Committee behind the smokescreen of anti-Communism was attacking the New Deal and defeating such great Americans as Frank Murphy, then a pro-labor Governor of Michigan, later a Justice of the Supreme Court. In 30 years of existence, the Committee has only on rare and fleeting occasions ever touched on any menace from the right. Its staff, like that of its counterpart in the Senate, Eastland's Internal Security Committee, is full of superannuated FBI men conditioned to nothing but anti-Communism and of ex-Communists who bring to the hunt an exaggerated notion of their old party's importance and the fanatic's readiness to twist the truth. It is characteristic that the "dean" of the crowd is a former business manager of *The Daily Worker*. Add the fact that McCarthyism never died out in the South, that perjurers and psychotics long discredited in Washington still perform before "little un-American committees" in the legislatures of the deep South, and that the whole area is convinced the Southern Negro would still be getting off the sidewalks if it weren't for a Communist plot. This assures that any Klan investigation by the un-Americans will soon turn into a circus designed to smear the civil rights movement.

There is a warning here for those inside civil rights organizations who have been leaking Red smears against CORE and SNCC. Columnists like Joe Alsop, David Lawrence, and Evans and Novack have become their sounding boards. The youngsters in CORE and SNCC have antagonized their elders by their brashness and conceit. But they have also brought fresh vigor to the fight. The kind of passionate devotion that makes youngsters ready to risk their lives in the South is not apt to be accompanied by sage moderation; if it were, they would have stayed at home. Only the sensitive the rebellious, the extremist could or would do what these often exasperating but wonderful youngsters have done. There are neither ties nor resemblances between them and the sedate elderly people who run the Communist Party in this country. They reflect, espouse and develop a whole range of radical ideas, social and racial, some of them wacky with despair. But every movement of liberation requires its fringe of zealots and wilder men; otherwise the moderates would have no way to scare the other side into compromise. I saw the process at work in the Jewish struggle against the British in Palestine where a handful of direct actionists, there men of the right, gave the moderates leverage. This is the normal dynamics of a liberation struggle, not a plot. The plot is the plot to split the movement and rid it of the indispensible zealots by imposing some kind of "loyalty" oath and exposing it to defamation and discredit by the un-Americans.

For Daring to Register

"I would like to tell you about one Negro who tried to vote in this county. She is a woman named Mary Thomas. She said she walked by the door (of the registrar) many times but was afraid to go in. One day she felt her prayers were answered and therefore she was not alone and decided to go in and register. She received a very difficult test and felt discouraged. When she left the room she was photographed which meant she would have trouble getting credit around town. She had a small business which she used to support herself and her six children. She was not back at the store fifteen minutes when the sheriff appeared and said, 'I have a warrant for your arrest.' Fifteen minutes after she had tried to register. He said, 'You are selling beer without a license.' She said, 'I have a state, a city and a federal license.' He said, 'You do not have a county license.' She was immediately taken to jail, locked up over night in jail without counsel, brought up the next day and fined over $300 for not having this $15 beer license from the county despite the fact that she had licenses to sell beer and had done so for over eight years."

—Reverend Theodore Hesburgh, Pres. of Notre Dame, and member of U.S. Civil Rights Commission, before House Judiciary, March 19.

We'll Be Glad to Send A Sample Copy of This Issue To A Friend — Send A Stamped Addressed Envelope

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

4/5/65

For the enclosed $5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....Zone.....State.....

For $5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July and August at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED